

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of various informalities and the title was deemed not descriptive.

The disclosure and title are amended per the Examiner. However, paragraph [0019] containing the “blowing all the fuses” is maintained. The interpretation of that paragraph is not related to blowing the fuses as an outcome of blowing the programming (first) fuse, as stated in the Office Action. The paragraph is not implying a causal relationship. Rather, there is a chain of many fuses. The first fuse and the last one are special and indicate a certain status to the rest of the system depending on if they are blown or still intact. If there is some problem with the grammar, would the Examiner please indicate it for the Applicants and paragraph [0019] may be amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fischer (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,953).

Claim 1, as amended, recites an “eFuse” memory that is not found in Fischer. This kind of memory is described in paragraphs [0018] - [0020]; no new matter is introduced. Therefore Claim 1 and its dependents, Claims 1 – 5, are believed allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 4 is amended to fix an antecedent issue with the word “the value”. In addition, the new limitation “random number is operable to be regenerated if the threshold value is not passed” is not found in Fischer. Support for the limitation is found in paragraph [0017]; no new matter is introduced.

Regarding Claims 5 and 9, Fischer is describing an asymmetric system with a key pair, a private and a public key, in contrast to the present invention which teaches a symmetric system. As the Examiner noted, Fischer stores the private key in memory Col 3 L. 30 – 35. However, the private key is not the random number generated; Fischer never stores in memory the output value of the random number generator. Claims 5 and 9 are amended to clarify that the root key in Applicants' invention comprises the random number. Therefore, Claims 5 and 9 which recite "permanently storing the random number" are believed allowable.

Claims 6 – 8, 10 – 11 should also be allowable by virtue of their dependency. Further Fisher does not teach the regeneration of the random number as recited in Claims 8 and 10, nor the detection of undesirable numbers of Claims 6, 7 and 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (u.s: Patent No. 5,422,953) and Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,853,884).

Claims 2, 3 are dependent on amended Claim 1 and therefore believed allowable because neither Fischer nor Brown teaches eFuse memory.

Claims 6, 7 and 10 are believed allowable by virtue of their dependency on Claims 5 and 9 which recite "permanently storing" the random number not found in either Fischer or Brown. The private key is not the random number generated; Fischer never stores in memory the output value of the random number generator.

New Claims

New dependent Claims 11, 13 recite eFuse memory supported by paragraphs [0018] - [0020]; no new matter is introduced. The limitation is not found in either reference.

New independent Claim 12 is similar to Claim 1 (original) but has the limitation about the “root key” and that the root key is “operable to seed a second random number operable to be a session key”. Support is found in paragraph [0024]; no new matter is introduced. Neither reference teaches the root key seeding a second random number. Dependent Claims 14 – 16 are like claims Claims 2 – 4; no new matter is introduced.

Respectful request is made for reconsideration of the application, as amended, and for an issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Please charge any missing fees to the deposit account 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dolly Y. Wu/
Dolly Y. Wu
Reg. No. 59,192
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972-917-4144